

<b>Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 09/731,945	<b>Applicant(s)</b> WALDROP ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b> MATTHEW J. DANIELS	<b>Art Unit</b> 1791	

**All Participants:**

**Status of Application:** Allowance

(1) MATTHEW J. DANIELS.

(3) \_\_\_\_\_

(2) Brett Halperin.

(4) \_\_\_\_\_

**Date of Interview:** 11 January 2008

**Time:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Type of Interview:**

- ☒ Telephonic  
☐ Video Conference  
☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☒ No

If Yes, provide a brief description:

**Part I.**

Rejection(s) discussed:

13,34,46,50,54

Claims discussed:

13,34,46,50,54

Prior art documents discussed:

Lang, Brittles

**Part II.**

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

See Continuation Sheet

**Part III.**

- ☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.  
☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.



(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: The methods of Lang and Brittles were discussed. The Examiner agreed that claim amendments which recite that the outer bag pressure is greater than the inner bag pressure appear to overcome the rejections set forth previously and distinguish the claimed invention from the prior art..